costs of nuclear plants in electric restructuring, so nuclear use is likely to fall.

Nuclear is the largest carbon-free generator of power. The President didn't even mention it in his plan.

Let us go to our next contributor—10 percent of our energy comes from hydroelectric. Yet, there are considerations in the administration to tear down dams. An example that has been discussed is the Glen Canyon Dam. If we tear down Glen Canyon, we would drain Lake Powell—252 square miles. That is a lake that provides the water for Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Las Vegas. It would eliminate sources of carbon-free electricity for 4 million consumers in the Southwest. We would scuttle a \$500 million tourist industry.

What about gas that supplies 10 percent of our power? Gas also emits carbons, but not as much. Demand would increase, prices would increase, and

shortages might result.

Some people say we will pick up the slack with wind and solar. I like wind and solar, but you can't always count on it. It is kind of interesting to see the Sierra's Club announcement the other day opposing wind farms. They refer to them as "Cuisinarts for birds." So they are opposed to that.

So the point is, Mr. President, how do you get there from here if the administration does not consider nuclear or hydroelectric? In his speech, the President specifically excludes hydro

from renewable energy.

What about the rest of the world? Let me tell you what one of our witnesses said at a hearing yesterday. Mr. Bill Martin, former Deputy Secretary of Energy, said the world is likely to increase its dependence on coal primarily due to energy demand in China. This dependence is likely to result in the doubling of sulfur dioxides in Asia and at least a 30-percent increase in global CO_2 , in 1990 levels, by the year 2000. To reach a sustainable energy with respect to carbon, the world will have to triple natural gas production, increase coal efficiencies through clean coal technology, triple renewables, triple nuclear power to a worldwide total of 1.000 gigawatts and increase energy efficiency by at least 25 percent.

Mr. President, these are the real terms and conditions in the world that we are living in. Nuclear energy, renewables and energy efficiency emerge as the only viable source to date that are emissions-free and offer some energy independence to nations which adopt them.

The point I want to make here, Mr. President, is that nuclear and hydro, a big part of the solution, are not addressed in the administration's proposal on how to reduce emissions to the 1990 level by the year 2008 to 2012.

The witnesses at the hearings we held yesterday said you cannot get there from here. You cannot physically do it unless you triple nuclear and the renewables, including hydro.

Let me conclude with one other thing. The President says we can do this without a carbon tax. The Department of Energy says you need a carbon permit price of \$50/ton. There is no difference. There are no free rides. Somebody has to pay it. If it is a carbon tax, it is \$50 a ton, and it goes to the consumer. If we set up some kind of a market in emissions, somebody like the Board of Trade starts trading permits, they are estimated to equate to \$50 a ton. Somebody is going to have to pay for that, and that is the U.S. consumer.

Let me conclude with just one observation as we address China, as we address the question of whether we should sell nuclear reactors and technology to China.

China has the availability of nuclear power reactors from France. They have it from other nations. Canada is selling; Russia is selling. And certainly they are a nuclear power.

Do we want China to burn more coal? We already have a prohibition against assisting China in the development of the world's largest hydroelectric project. It is called the Three Gorges Dam. The Eximbank will not assist.

Let me tell you how big Three Gorges is. That plant would produce 18,000 megawatts, equal to 36 500-megawatt coal plants. So that is how China will address some of its energy demands from carbon-free hydropower. But we are prohibited from participating. And we are prohibited from participating in their nuclear power program.

So I think, Mr. President, we have to be realistic. As the administration comes down with its plan, again, I suggest to you that the President has glossed over the issue of the developing countries' participation.

I suggest and remind my colleagues of the Byrd-Hagel vote that was 95 to 0. It said developing nations must have targets and timetables in the same timeframe as the United States. And the Berlin Mandate says, no new commitments for developing nations.

So I conclude by saying the President only says "meaningful commitments for developing nations." And I say "meaningful" means what?

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, October 23, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,424,897,442,383.46. (Five trillion, four hundred twenty-four billion, eight hundred ninety-seven million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents)

One year ago, October 23, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,229,624,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-nine billion, six hundred twenty-four million)

Five years ago, October 23, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,061,912,000,000. (Four trillion, sixty-one billion, nine hundred twelve million)

Ten years ago, October 23, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,384,077,000,000

(Two trillion, three hundred eighty-four billion, seventy-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$3 trillion—\$3,040,820,442,383.46 (Three trillion, forty billion, eight hundred twenty million, four hundred forty-two thousand, three hundred eighty-three dollars and forty-six cents) during the past 10 years.

 $\begin{array}{cccc} \text{AN} & \text{EMMY} & \text{FOR} & \text{KEVIN} \\ \text{WALLEVAND: LAND MINE DOCUMENTARY} & \text{CONTROL OF THE MALE NAMED AND MINE DOCUMENTARY} \end{array}$

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President. A bright young reporter, Kevin Wallevand, who covers news in Fargo, ND for WDAY television, has made my State, and me, awfully proud. Kevin's documentary, "The Quilt: Hope from the Heartland," has been awarded an Emmy, television's highest award.

In North Dakota, we have always known that Kevin is a talented reporter, writer, and producer. Now, his documentary about the dark side of human nature that allows exploding land mines to do the work of war; and the bright side of human kind, the compassion people show toward one another in the aftermath of war's tragedies, has earned him national acclaim.

Kevin Wallevand has produced a moving story about a rural community where women create by hand a beautiful, colorful quilt in the hope that it will warm and cheer someone less fortunate than themselves. The resulting quilt begins its travels near the North Dakota border on the Buffalo River, and ends its journey along a river in Angola, Africa where a homeless family—bodies ravaged by exploding land mines—clutches the quilt for warmth and safety.

Sadly, we learn that the family's story is not an isolated one. Kevin takes us into the hospital beds of other villagers who have fallen victim to landmines—who are displaced and anticipating the help and the arrival of thousands of quilts, blankets and other donated items from American volunteers.

Hundreds of churches, like the one in Kevin's story, and other humanitarian groups have taken it upon themselves to give a little comfort and a little hope to landmine victims. Now we, as a country, owe it to them to prevent this instrument of war, which targets innocent people long after the peace agreement has been signed, from ever being used again.

Like Kevin, I have seen first hand the tragic human costs of landmines. While serving in the House of Representatives, I visited a clinic in Central America where landmine victims who had lost hope, along with a leg or an arm, were fitted for artificial limbs. I witnessed how important it was to support this program which could turn their lives around. When I returned, I worked to get funding so that other landmine victims might be able to get prosthetic limbs and I'm proud to say I helped get it done. Kevin must have